



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,131	04/15/2004	Peter JOHNSON	PZT-001	3130
24280	7590	09/27/2006	EXAMINER	
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE BOSTON, MA 02110			DATSKOVSKIY, SERGEY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2121	

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/709,131	Applicant(s) JOHNSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Sergey Datskovskiy	Art Unit 2121	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-11 and 13-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4 and 12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 have been submitted for examination.
2. Claims 1-3, 5-11 and 13-20 have been rejected.
3. Claims 4 and 12 have been objected.

Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "and/or to administer the legislation" is repeated twice. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2121

5. Claims 5-7, 9-11, 13-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Voermans ("Modelling the draughtman's craft: the LEDA-project Legimatics and legimatica-projects in the Netherlands").

Claim 5

Voermans teaches a rule based computerized method of writing legislation, the method including:--

developing a computerized database containing a set of declarative rules expressed in the general format "IF [premise], THEN [conclusion]" in accordance with which the legislation can be written (page 122, last paragraph discloses the use of database containing links and procedures; see also page 129 for examples of implemented if-then rules), and

utilizing the computerized database to write the legislation in accordance with the set of rules (page 120, document drafting and assembly support);

wherein the rules are written in a format or representation corresponding to acceptable legislation whereby the legislation is written in a format or representation corresponding to the set of declarative rules (page 128, deontic operators serve as a base for the declarative rules in a legislation; last paragraph gives an example of declarative rule), and

wherein the writing of legislation includes at least one of the following functions: drafting legislation, testing and refining draft legislation, enactment of legislation (page 120, document drafting).

Claim 6

Voermans teaches a rule based computerized method of writing legislation, wherein a computerized database is developed containing a set of declarative rules in accordance with which the legislation can be written (page 122, last paragraph discloses the use of database containing links and procedures; see also page 129 for examples of implemented if-then rules), the rules being written in a format or representation corresponding to acceptable legislation whereby the legislation is written in a format or representation corresponding to the set of declarative rules (page 128, deontic operators serve as a base for the declarative rules in a legislation; last paragraph gives an example of declarative rule), the computerized database being utilized to write the legislation in accordance with the set of rules (page 120, document drafting and assembly support); the method including:--

developing a plurality of agreed legislative drafting conventions which constrain the drafting of legislation in accordance with a logical structure (page 115, seven steps of the drafting process), and

designing a computer model incorporating the agreed legislative drafting conventions (page 122, knowledge-based modelling of a hypertetnetwork).

Claim 7

Voermans teaches a rule based computerized method of writing legislation, the method including:--

developing a computerized database containing a set of declarative rules in accordance with which the legislation can be written (page 122, last paragraph discloses the use of database containing links and procedures; see also page 129 for examples of implemented if-then rules), and

utilizing the computerized database to write the legislation in accordance with the set of rules (page 120, document drafting and assembly support);

wherein the rules are written in a format or representation corresponding to acceptable legislation whereby the legislation is written in a format or representation corresponding to the set of declarative rules (page 128, deontic operators serve as a base for the declarative rules in a legislation; last paragraph gives an example of declarative rule);

wherein a plurality of agreed legislative drafting conventions constrain the drafting of legislation in accordance with a logical structure (page 115, seven steps of the drafting process), and

wherein the agreed legislative drafting conventions are incorporated in a computer model (page 122, knowledge-based modelling of a hypertetnetwork).

Claim 9

Voermans teaches a rule based computerized method of writing legislation as claimed in claim 7 and further including:--providing enhancements to the task of editing when drafting legislation whereby the use of the legislative drafting conventions is facilitated (page 131, last paragraph before chapter 7; editing is enhanced by supplying

Art Unit: 2121

the user with a powerful intelligent recommendations check of his natural language draft).

Claim 10

Voermans teaches a rule based computerized method of writing legislation as claimed in claim 9 and further including:--creating a legislative parser to convert the text of the legislation to a form that can be checked against the computer model and to report any failures to the drafter of the legislation (page 127, the CD parser).

Claim 11

Voermans teaches a rule based computerized method of writing legislation as claimed in claim 10 and further including:--creating facilities to import the parsed legislation into a pre-existing legislative rulebase technology, and to generate a rulebase (page 127, last line through page 128, line 3).

Claim 13

Voermans teaches a computer program embodied on a machine readable medium that operates a method as claimed in claim 1, for developing, implementing and administering legislation (page 117, last paragraph; disclosed is a computer-implemented AI system LEDA, it is inherent for such system to be embodied on a computer readable medium).

Claim 14

Voermans teaches a computer program embodied on a machine readable medium that operates a method as claimed in claim any one of claims 5 of writing legislation (page 117, last paragraph; disclosed is a computer-implemented AI system LEDA, it is inherent for such system to be embodied on a computer readable medium).

Claim 15

Voermans teaches a rule based computerized system for developing, implementing and administering legislation, the system including:--

a computerized database containing a set of declarative rules in accordance with which the legislation can be developed, written and delivered (page 122, last paragraph discloses the use of database containing links and procedures; see also page 129 for examples of implemented if-then rules), and

program means for executing the set of rules to develop the policy for the legislation (page 120, the Preparatory (policy) Module) and/or to write the legislation (page 120, document drafting) and/or to administer the legislation (page 119; one of the goals of LEDA project is to make the information, referred in the recommendations available to the users. That includes recommendations concerning procedures, and implies administering the legislation) and/or to administer the legislation and/or evaluate the legislation (page 115 lists evaluation as on of the steps of the drafting process, see also page 116, paragraph 2);

wherein the policy development, writing of legislation, service design, administration and/or evaluation are functionally integrated by the computerized database (page 122, last paragraph; functional integration is disclosed by the use of hypertext technology).

Claim 16

Voermans teaches a computer program embodied on a machine readable medium that provides a system as claimed in claim 15 for developing, implementing and administering legislation (page 117, last paragraph; disclosed is a computer-implemented AI system LEDA, it is inherent for such system to be embodied on a computer readable medium).

Claim 17

Voermans teaches a rule based computerized system for writing legislation, the system including:--

a computerized database containing a set of declarative rules in accordance with which the legislation can be written (page 122, last paragraph discloses the use of database containing links and procedures; see also page 129 for examples of implemented if-then rules), and

program means for executing the set of rules to write the legislation (page 117, last paragraph; disclosed is a computer-implemented AI system LEDA);

wherein the rules are written in a format or representation corresponding to acceptable legislation whereby the legislation is written in a format or representation corresponding to the set of declarative rules (page 128, deontic operators serve as a base for the declarative rules in a legislation; last paragraph gives an example of declarative rule).

Claim 18

Voermans teaches a rule based computerized system for writing legislation as claimed in claim 17, wherein a plurality of agreed legislative drafting conventions constrain the drafting of legislation in accordance with a logical structure (page 115, seven steps of the drafting process), and wherein the program means utilizes a computer model incorporating the agreed legislative drafting conventions (page 122, knowledge-based modelling of a hypertetnetwork).

Claim 20

Voermans teaches a computer program embodied on a machine readable medium that operates a system as claimed in claim 17, for writing legislation (page 117, last paragraph; disclosed is a computer-implemented AI system LEDA, it is inherent for such system to be embodied on a computer readable medium).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voermans ("Modelling the draughtman's craft: the LEDA-project Legimatics and legimatica-projects in the Netherlands") in view of Brown et al. (US App. No. 2002/0107698).

Claim 1

Voermans teaches a rule based computerized method of developing, implementing and administering legislation, the method including:--

developing a computerized database containing a set of declarative rules in accordance with which the legislation can be developed, written in and delivered (page 122, last paragraph discloses the use of database containing links and procedures; see also page 129 for examples of implemented if-then rules);

utilizing the computerized database to develop the policy for the legislation in accordance with the set of rules (page 120, the Preparatory (policy) Module);

utilizing the computerized database to write the legislation in accordance with the set of rules (page 120, document drafting and assembly support);

utilizing the computerized database to design the service to administer the legislation in accordance with the set of rules (page 119; one of the goals of LEDA

Art Unit: 2121

project is to make the information, referred in the recommendations available to the users. That includes recommendations concerning procedures, and implies administering the legislation), and

utilizing the computerized database to administer and/or evaluate the legislation in accordance with the set of rules (page 115 lists evaluation as one of the steps of the drafting process, see also page 116, paragraph 2);

wherein the policy development, writing of legislation, service design, administration and/or evaluation are functionally integrated by the computerized database (page 122, last paragraph; functional integration is disclosed by the use of hypertext technology);

wherein the rules are such as can be expressed in the general format "IF [premise], THEN [conclusion]" (page 129, examples of operations are all expressed in if-then format);

wherein the policy development includes at least one of the following functions: policy analysis, development of policy options, public consultation, testing and refining policy (page 125, first paragraph; discloses user-analysis of options);

wherein the writing of legislation includes at least one of the following functions: drafting legislation, testing and refining draft legislation, enactment of legislation (page 120, document drafting);

wherein the service design includes at least one of the following functions: testing impact of final legislation, translation of legislation into operational policy (page 128, last paragraph and page 129 disclose an example of translating into operational policy),

data requirements analysis, design of service delivery structures and systems, public education;

wherein the administration includes at least one of the following functions: public education, staff training, delivery of services (page 120, knowledge-based information retrieval, page 125, last 5 lines).

Voermans does not expressly teach that the evaluation includes at least one of the following functions: design of policy impact measurement, measurement of policy impact.

Brown teaches measurement of policy impact (paragraph [0011]).

Voermans and Brown are analogous art since they are both computerized methods of legislation design. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the method of measuring policy impact from Brown and combine it with evaluation of the new legislation from Voermans. The reason for doing so would be to calculate the impact on user of a new legislation having a quantitative impact, such as a tax legislation (Brown, paragraphs [0004], [0012]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Voermans in view of Brown by measuring policy impact during evaluation process.

Claim 2

Voermans teaches a rule based method of developing, implementing and administering legislation as claimed in claim 1 wherein the rules are written in a spoken language (page 128, last paragraph), the method further including:--converting the rules

when written in the spoken language into a stylized or symbolic format or representation (page 128, 1. a deontic normoperator; see also page 112, lines 4-10).

Claim 3

Voermans teaches a rule based method of developing, implementing and administering legislation as claimed in claim 2, wherein the rules are written in a format or representation corresponding to acceptable legislation whereby the legislation is written in a format or representation corresponding to the set of declarative rules (page 128, deontic operators serve as a base for the declarative rules in a legislation; last paragraph gives an example of declarative rule).

7. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voermans ("Modelling the draughtman's craft: the LEDA-project Legimatics and legimatica-projects in the Netherlands").

Claim 8

Voermans does not expressly teach a rule based computerized method of writing legislation as claimed in claim 6, wherein the computer model is an XML schema.

Examiner takes an Official Notice that XML standard was well known in the art at the time the invention was made.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the computer model as an XML schema since

Examiner takes Official Notice that XML standard is well known in the art and could be used for representing the hypertext network database.

Claim 19

Voermans does not expressly teach a rule based computerized system for writing legislation as claimed in claim 18, wherein the computer model is an XML schema.

Examiner takes an Official Notice that XML standard was well known in the art at the time the invention was made.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the computer model as an XML schema since Examiner takes Official Notice that XML standard is well known in the art and could be used for representing the hypertext network database.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 4 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Arnold-Moore teaches "Automatic generation of amendment

legislation". Logghe et al. teaches "Automatic Version Management of Legislation: The Agora-Lex Project". Arnold-Moore teaches "Automatically Processing Amendments to Legislation". Greenleaf et al. teaches "More than a wishful thinking: AustLII's legal inferencing via the World Wide Web".

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sergey Datskovskiy whose telephone number is (571) 272-8188. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Knight, can be reached on (571) 272-3687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

S.D.



Anthony Knight

Art Unit: 2121

Assistant examiner

Supervisory Patent Examiner

A.U. 2121

Technology Center 2100